

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,498	07/11/2003	Rich Huang	252011-1520 5392	
47390	7590 03/24/2006	EXAMINER		INER
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HOSTEMEYER & RISLEY LLP			ADAMS, GREGORY W	
100 GALLER	IA PARKWAY			
<b>SUITE 1750</b>			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ATLANTA, GA 30339		3652	= :	

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/618,498	HUANG ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Gregory W. Adams	3652		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 Ja</u> 2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This  3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4)	vn from consideration.			
Application Papers	•			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the original transfer and the correction is objected to by the Examiner.	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Uther:				

Application/Control Number: 10/618,498

Art Unit: 3652

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 1-6, 10, 13-15, 19 & 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fosnight (US 5,980,183) in view of Schurch et al. (US 3,698,3326) and Perlov et al. (US 6,283,692). Fosnight discloses a load port transfer device 34, 42 including a load port 50, a transport rail vertical portion 122b beside an overhead conveying system 118 wherein a vertical portion top portion is beside an overhead conveying system and extends from a load port 110 and a horizontal portion 130a-b is above a conveying system 118, a robot 116 (FIG. 10;C9/L33-39; C10/L1-10) which moves along a rail to transfer a wafer carrier between a load port 50 and an overhead conveying system 30, 270, flange 120 and does not disclose a roller and timing belt.

Schurch et al. disclose a transport rail vertical portion 2a, a transport rail horizontal portion 2 wherein a vertical portion top portion connects to a horizontal portion, and a robot 4, 5, 7 that moves along vertical and horizontal portions. Schurch further discloses a robot moving mechanism 4, 5, 7 having rollers disposed along a rail and a robot holding mechanism 19, 21 that maintains a carrier 20 horizontal wherein a holding mechanism first end is removably connected to a carrier 20 and holding mechanism second end is movably connected to a moving mechanism 4, 5, 7. Schurch

teaches that in the art of conveying over horizontal and vertical rails by movably connecting a holding mechanism to a moving mechanism it is advantageous to maintain a container 20 in vertical position. Cols. 1-2. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fosnight's vertical rail with a rail having a vertical portion connected to a horizontal portion and a robot having rollers, as per the teachings of Schurch, such that during conveying a carrier is maintained in vertical position.

Perlov discloses a timing belt to drive a robot both vertically and horizontally.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify a mechanism of Fosnight to include a timing belt, as per the teachings of Perlov, to drive a robot vertically and horizontally.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed January 27, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claims 1, 13 & 22-23, Applicant argues that Schurch does not disclose a horizontal portion "located above the conveyor". Fosnight discloses a robot 116 that moves along horizontal and vertical portions of a rail wherein a horizontal portion is above a conveyor system (FIG. 4: 118).

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was

Art Unit: 3652

. . ?

within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In this case, in replacing Fosnight's rail and robot Schurch recognizes that "in the event that the transport units must also travel over vertical or inclined track rails, then special measures have to be undertaken if a prerequisite of the conveying operation requires the load containers to be continuously transported in a vertical or near vertical position." C/L16-20.

#### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory W. Adams whose telephone number is (571) 272-8101. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th., 8:00-5.

Application/Control Number: 10/618,498

Art Unit: 3652

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen Lillis can be reached on (571) 272-6928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**GWA** 

EILEEN D. LILLIS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Page 5